Doc. 3 Rose et al v. Miller et al Case 2:06-cv-01115-RSM Document 3 Filed 08/09/2006 Page 1 of 2 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 3 NEIL M. ROSE, et al., 4 Plaintiff(s), 5 NO. C06-1115RSM v. 6 ORDER ON EMERGENCY MOTION CRAIG WILLIAM MILLER, et al., FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 7 Defendant(s). 8 9 The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed: 10 Emergency Motion for Injunctive Relief 11 Complaint for Damages 2. 12 and all exhibits and declarations attached thereto, makes the following ruling: 13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Emergency Motion for Injunctive Relief is DENIED. 14 15 This matter was filed on August 8, 2006 and assigned to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez. 16 As Judge Martinez was unavailable to review Plaintiff's motion on the day of filing, the matter was 17 referred to the Honorable Marsha J. Pechman due to the allegations of the emergency nature of the 18 motion. 19 Plaintiff's motion (which he titled an "Emergency Motion for Injunctive Relief" and which the 20 Court is treating as a request for a Temporary Restraining Order ["TRO"]) is deficient in several 21 respects. FRCP 65 sets forth the requirements for such an extraordinary form of injunctive relief and 22 none of those requirements are met by Plaintiff's pleadings or proposed order. Specifically, Plaintiff's 23

motion is lacking:

1. An application for TRO which defines the nature of the injury and why it is irreparable;

ORD ON MTN FOR **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF - 1**

24

25

26

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

26

ORD ON MTN FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF - 2